

OPINION 2376 (Case 3638)***Saturnia canningi* Hutton, 1859 (currently *Samia canningi*; Insecta, Lepidoptera, SATURNIIDAE): name conserved**

Abstract. Under the plenary power the Commission has conserved the specific name of *Saturnia canningi* Hutton, 1859, the progenitor of *Samia ricini* (Jones, 1791). Both names have been used widely and consistently by authors in the entomological and sericultural literature for over 150 years to refer to the wild and domesticated entities, respectively. The name *Saturnia canningi* has been added to the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, and can continue to be used when referring to the wild form.

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; *Samia*; *Samia canningi*; *Samia ricini*; eri silk; eri silkmoth; India; wild silk.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary power it is hereby ruled that the name *canningi* Hutton, 1859, as published in the binomen *Saturnia canningi*, is not invalid by reason of being pre-dated by a name based on a domestic form, *Phalaena ricini* Jones, 1791, whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms;
- (2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
 - (a) *canningi* Hutton, 1859, as published in the binomen *Saturnia canningi*, with the endorsement that it is not invalid by reason of being pre-dated by a name based on a domestic form;
 - (b) *ricini* Jones in Anderson, 1791, as published in the binomen *Phalaena ricini*.

History of Case 3638

An application to conserve the specific name *Saturnia canningi* Hutton, 1859 for the wild form of the eri silk moth was received from Richard S. Peigler (*Department of Biology, University of the Incarnate Word, San Antonio, Texas, U.S.A.*) and Reeta Luikham (*Regional Tasar Research Station, Central Silk Board, Mantripukhri, Manipur, India*) on 24 July 2013. After correspondence the Case was published in BZN 70: 229–233 (December 2013). The title, abstract and keywords of the Case were published on the Commission's website. Comments on this Case were published in BZN 72: 56 (March 2015). The Case was sent for vote on 1 September 2015. A greater than two-thirds majority of Commissioners voted FOR the Case (18 For, 2 Against, 1 Split).

Decision of the Commission

At the close of the voting period on 1 December 2015 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes – 18: Ballerio, Bouchet, Brothers, Grygier, Halliday, Harvey, Kojima, Kottelat, Krell, Kullander, Lamas, Pape, Pyle, Rosenberg, van Tol, Winston, Yanega, and Zhou.

Negative votes – 2: Alonso-Zarazaga and Zhang
Fautin, Ng, Patterson and Štys were on leave of absence.
Split votes – 1: Bogutskaya (Abstain (1), For (2))

Voting FOR, Kojima said that as this proposal includes a taxonomic aspect, namely, whether *Samia canningi* (Hutton, 1859) and *Samia ricini* (Jones, 1791) are different species or synonyms, the following phrase should be added at the end of Para 9 (1): ‘*Phalaena ricini* Jones, 1791 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms’. Also voting FOR, Winston said that the wild and domesticated species were clearly distinct, and even within the domesticated form, molecular genetic studies had shown different populations that represented different ecotypes that should be conserved to preserve genetic diversity. Still, as has happened with other wild and domesticated taxa, it was wise to rule on the conservation of both names, she added.

SPLITTING her vote, Bogutskaya said that she saw an internal conflict of logic in that the Commission was asked to rule that the name *canningi* Hutton, 1859 . . . is not invalid = the name *canningi* is valid = the name *canningi* has precedence over *ricini* and is the only name applied for the species (though it includes two forms). But this is not what the author actually asked for. She thought that the Case was taxonomic rather than nomenclatural as the eri silk community just needed to accept that there were two species instead of one and use both valid names.

Voting AGAINST, Alonso-Zarazaga said that according to the Code, one species must have one valid name only. If the authors think that the wild form of *Samia ricini* (Jones in Anderson, 1791) merited a special name, they could use a non-Linnean, genetic term: ‘phenotype *canningi*’, without authorship and date. He noted that phenotypes could also be easily differentiated within the same species, so this was not a weighty reason to support this application.

Original references

The following are the original references to the entries on an Official List in the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- canningi* Hutton, 1859, Notes on the silkworms of India. *Journal of the Agricultural and Horticultural Society of India*, **11**(1): 28.
- ricini* Jones in Anderson, 1791, *Correspondence for the introduction of cochineal insects from America, the varnish and tallow trees from China, the discovery and culture of white lac, the culture of red lac, and also for the introduction, culture, and establishment of mulberry trees and silk worms, with a description and drawing of an improved Piemontese reel for the manufacture of raw silk, together with the culture of the finest cinnamon trees of Ceylon, indigo and some other valuable articles*. Joseph Martin, Madras, p. 43.